DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 244 693 JC 840 286

AUTHOR Scott, David C.
TITLE 1984 Survey of Bakersfield College Radiologic Technician Graduates.
INSTITUTION Bakersfield Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE May 84
NOTE 17p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Graduates; Community Colleges; *Employment Patterns; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; *Participant Satisfaction; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; *Radiographers; *Radiologic Technologists; Two Year Colleges; Vocational Followup

ABSTRACT

In 1984, a study was conducted to assess the success of Bakersfield College's radiologic technician program in preparing graduates for employment; to provide information for accreditation, evaluation, and long-range planning purposes; and to compare results with a 1977 survey of program graduates. Questionnaires, requesting information on graduates' background, employment experiences since graduation, and reactions to the curriculum and instruction, were sent to 105 individuals who graduated from the program between 1971 and 1982. Study findings, based on a 52.4% response rate, included the following: (1) 70.4% of the graduates were female, 70% were between the ages of 26 and 35, and 55.6% had only a high school diploma prior to entry in the radiologic technician program; (2) 94.4% of the respondents had obtained employment as radiographers, and of these 88.2% were working full-time; (3) 77% of the respondents were earning more than $20,000 per year; (4) 57.4% had a realistic picture of radiologic technology before they entered the program, as compared with 32.4% of the respondents to the 1977 survey; (5) 95.5% said they would recommend the program to a friend, compared to 85.3% in 1977; and (6) 85.2% felt the course content was excellent or good, 68.6% thought classroom experiences were interesting or very interesting, and 96.4% thought the clinical experience was interesting or very interesting. The survey instrument and cover letter are appended. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Bakersfield College founded 1913

ED244693

1984 Survey
of
Bakersfield College
Radiologic Technician Graduates

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Scott

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
✓ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

May, 1984

David C. Scott
Dean of Administrative Services

JC 840 286

Done at the Request of
Nancy Perkins
Coordinator & Assistant Professor
RT Program

1801 Panorama Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93305 • tel:(805) 395-4011 • Kern Community College District

SUMMARY OF THE 1984 SURVEY OF BC RT GRADUATES

Survey Procedures

The purpose of the survey was to provide information which will aid in assessing the curricular offerings and instructional approaches in Bakersfield College's RT program. The questionnaire was designed to assess the success of the program in preparing graduates for employment, to provide information for accreditation and evaluation purposes, and to provide information for long range planning for the program.

A questionnaire had been sent to RT graduates in 1977 so another purpose was to provide a basis for comparing the program as viewed by graduates in 1977 with the views of graduates in 1984. Since the 1982 class was the first directed by Nancy Perkins, it was hoped to make some comparisons between the pre-Perkins and post-Perkins programs.

The questionnaire, a revised version of the 1977 instrument, was designed by Nancy Perkins and David Scott, Dean of Administrative Services. It contained questions based on the background of graduates, employment experiences since graduation, and reaction to the curriculum and instruction in the program.

The questionnaires were mailed to RT graduates at their home addresses on February 9 -- 105 were sent out, 55 were returned (a 52.4% rate of return).

Returns of graduating classes were: 1971 - 6; 1972 - 3; 1973 - 2; 1974 - 12; 1976 - 8; 1978 - 8; 1980 - 9; and 1982 - 7.

This survey report includes both numerical response analysis and a summary of written comments. Total number and percentage listings for all questions are included in the appendix. Comparisons, where significant, are made with responses to the 1977 questionnaire. Since only seven in

in the class of 1982 responded and their reactions to the programs were similar to previous groups, the report includes very little pre-Perkins and post-Perkins comparisons. Also, it should be mentioned that 1977 and 1984 respondents included some of the same people.

Background Data of Graduates

Thirty-eight, or 70.4%, of the respondents were female; 16, or 29.6%, were male. Ages were 20 to 25 - 12.7%; 26 to 30 - 45.5%; 31 to 35 - 25.5%; 36 to 40 - 7.3%, and 8.9% were above 40. Of those responding, 94.6% were U.S. citizens. Other citizenships (1 each) were Vietnamese, Mexican and Philipino. Also, 24.1% were bilingual.

Of those surveyed, 55.6% had only a high school diploma prior to entry into the RT program, 18.5% had an A.A. Degree, 25.9% had had some college.

Primary influences listed by the respondents for going into the RT program were (a) inner motivation - 43.6%, (b) advice of high school counselor - 5.5%, (c) advice of friend - 3.6%, (d) parental influence - 1.6%, (e) advice of other relatives - 1.8%, and the remainder of the reasons were a combination of the above. The 1977 motivations were almost identical.

Health Career experience prior to entry into the program was noted by 27.3% of the respondents (11.4% in 1977); 30.9% had switched to RT from another program (34.3% in 1977).

Employment Information

Fifty-one of the 55 respondents (94.4%) had obtained employment as a radiographer. See appendix for exact title of jobs. Of these, 88.2% were working full-time. Of those responding, 56.6% were working in an acute hospital, 15.1% were working in a radiologist's office, and 9.4% were working in a physician's office. The majority (76.8%) were working in Kern County and 88.2% indicated that they wished to continue to work in Kern County.

These percentages are very similar to those in the 1977 survey.

Salary levels were reported as follows: Above $22,000 - 31 (59.6%), $20,001 to $22,000 - 9 (17.3%), $18,001 to $20,000 - 6 (11.5%). In 1977 the median salary was approximately $13,000.

Of those responding, 86.8% felt their expectation of their present job in radiology was realistic. The figure in the 1977 survey was 85.3%.

Questions concerning in-service training and/or orientation in their present job yielded the following responses:

Type of Orientation offered by Employer

	1977		1984	
Orientation Length	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
None	2	6.3	5	11.1
One week	10	31.3	7	15.6
Two weeks	5	15.6	15	33.3
Three weeks	1	3.1	1	2.2
One month	8	25.0	6	13.3
More than one month	3	9.4	6	13.3
Other	3	9.4	5	11.1

	1977		1984	
Amount of Orientation Felt Necessary	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
None			4	8.5
One week	10	32.3	11	23.4
Two weeks	7	22.6	14	29.8
Three weeks	2	6.6	1	2.1
One month	11	35.6	14	29.8
More than one month	1	2.2	2	4.3

Reactions to BC Program

Of those surveyed, 57.4% had a realistic picture of what radiologic technology was all about before entering the program. This compares favorably with the 32.4% response in the 1977 survey. Forty-nine of 53 (95.5%) having

completed the program said they would recommend it to a friend who was qualified to enter (the 1977 response was 85.3% affirmative).

Respondents gave the program high marks in course content, classroom experience, and clinical experience. In all cases ratings were higher than 1977, particularly in classroom time. Ratings were as follows:

	1977		1984	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Course Content				
Excellent	7	20.0	21	38.9
Good	17	48.6	25	46.3
Adequate	10	28.6	8	14.8
Poor	1	2.9	0	
Classroom Time				
Very Interesting	3	8.6	9	16.7
Interesting	9	25.7	28	51.9
All Right	18	51.4	15	28.8
Dull	5	14.3	2	3.7
Clinical Time				
Very Interesting	20	57.1	28	50.9
Interesting	12	34.3	25	45.5
All Right	2	5.7	2	3.6
Dull	1	2.9		

The RT staff received high marks on being supportive when advice or encouragement was needed as was the case in 1977:

	1977		1984	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Definitely Supportive	15	42.9	36	65.5
Somewhat Supportive	19	54.3	13	26.3
Minimum Help	1	2.9	6	10.9

When asked how well they were prepared for new employer expectations, respondents replied: very well - 59.3%, adequately - 38.9%, poorly - 1.9%. Instructors expectations and employer expectations were rated very similar or usually the same by 86.8%.

When asked how the following measures indicated their ability to perform as a registered radiographer, respondents replied:

		Number	Percent
American Registry of Radiographic Technologists and State of California Certified Radiologic Technologist Licensure Exam.....	Very well	30	55.6
	Adequately	22	40.7
	Not at all	2	3.7
Grades received in radiologic technology courses (RT, medical terminology, and patient care).....	Very well	21	39.6
	Adequately	30	56.6
	Not at all	2	3.8
Grades received in life science and math courses (chemistry, anatomy, physiology, algebra).....	Very well	14	26.9
	Adequately	34	65.4
	Not at all	4	7.7
Grades received in communications courses (English, speech).....	Very well	9	17.3
	Adequately	35	67.3
	Not at all	8	15.4

Rankings of the program were high for the pre-Perkins and post-Perkins groups.

Strengths and weaknesses of the program as perceived by those who responded to the question are indicated below. Generally, students were very complimentary of both Mrs. Boyce and Mrs. Perkins.

First Year Strengths

- °Good emphasis on fundamentals and positioning techniques.
- °Anatomy and physiology courses are well taught.
- °Medical terminology is thoroughly taught.
- °Staff is enthusiastic and helpful.
- °Mrs. Perkins does an excellent job of laying out the course objectives.

First Year Weaknesses

- °Physics should be taught before students go into the program.
- °Instructor is biased toward certain individuals in the class.
- °The counselor associated with the program was very discouraging.
- °More clinical site preparation is needed.
- °Class time sometimes is too repetitious.

Second Year Strengths

- °Preparation for examinations is outstanding.
- °Staff is supportive and answers all questions.

Second Year Strengths - Continued

- °Positioning and techniques are presented well.
- °Clinical experience is outstanding.
- °Instructor is extremely knowledgeable.

Second Year Weaknesses

- °Class lectures are boring and repetitious.
- °Too much time is spent in test preparation rather than job preparation.
- °Instructor not sympathetic toward student financial problems.
- °Preparation for specialty examinations could be improved.
- °Students overworked and exploited by hospital staff.
- °Hospitals are overcrowded with students.
- °Rotation from hospital to hospital is not well conducted.

Continuing Education Classes

The RT graduates expressed much interest in continuing their education. Of those responding, 30.9% had enrolled in additional courses leading to additional licenses or a baccalaureate degree; 39.6% had enrolled in courses unrelated to radiologic technology. Approximately two-thirds listed courses that they would like to see offered through the continuing education program at Bakersfield College.

Most of the respondents expressed the need for training in new areas of specialization and technology that had emerged in the RT field since they had graduated. Beside technical update, they expressed an interest in management personnel proceedings and stress management in a hospital environment.

Some of the courses felt needed are: digital computer radiology, CAT scanning, radiation therapy, advanced positioning techniques, nuclear medicine, emergency medical care, ultrasound techniques, more physics and anatomy.

Conclusions

Both the 1977 survey and the 1984 survey indicated that Bakersfield College runs a quality RT program. Students find jobs in the Kern County area that pay well. They are enthused about the quality of course and clinical training

they have received. With minor modifications, the program should be continued as it now exists. Advanced training through continuing education should be offered to Bakersfield College RT graduates.

Bakersfield College founded 1913

February 9, 1984

Dear Bakersfield College RT Graduate:

Bakersfield College needs your help. The College is conducting a survey of RT graduates. Results of the study will be used to strengthen the radiography program curriculum, assess the health manpower needs in Kern County and will be included in the re-evaluation and accreditation process of the RT program by both the State Department of Health Services and the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology.

The enclosed survey questionnaire is divided into three parts:

1. Background Data (1-9)
2. RT Employment Information (10-25)
3. Reaction to Bakersfield College Program (26-39)

Circle only one item under each question. Please feel free to write comments on any item listed. When you have completed the questionnaire, mail it in the enclosed stamped addressed envelope. You will note that the envelope has your name in the upper left corner; this is for statistical purposes of checking off your name when the survey instrument is returned. Following this, the envelope will be destroyed and no record will be kept of your individual response, so please be honest!

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in completing the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Nancy O. Perkins

Nancy O. Perkins, RT (R)
Coordinator & Assistant Professor
RT Program

David C. Scott

David C. Scott
Dean
Administrative Services

1801 Panorama Drive, Bakersfield, CA 93305 • tel:(805) 395-4011 • Kern Community College District

QUESTIONNAIRE-BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY GRADUATE STUDY

In the column below, please circle the most appropriate response.

Background Data

1. Sex

Female		Male	
38	70.4%	16	29.6%

2. Age

20-25	7	12.7%
26-30	25	45.5%
31-35	14	25.5%
36-40	4	7.3%
41-45	3	5.5%
46-50	1	1.8%
51-55	1	1.8%
56 and above		

3. Citizenship

United States	52	94.6%
Other (please specify)	3	5.4% (Vietnam, Mexico Philipphines)

4. Bilingual

Yes		No	
13	24.1%	41	75.9%

If your response is yes, which language (s)?
1 German & Filipino; 1 Chinese, Vietnamese & French; 8 Spanish; 2 German; 1 German & Russian

5. Year of high school graduation — See attached.

6. Educational background immediately prior to entry into the R.T. program at Bakersfield College.....

High School diploma	30	55.6%
Associate Degree	10	18.5%
Other (please specify) Some college	14	25.9%

7. What influenced you to go into the field of radiologic technology?

Parental influence	1	1.8%
Other relative(s)	1	1.8%
High school counseling	3	5.5%
High school teacher(s)	0	
College teacher(s)	2	3.6%
Inner motivation	24	43.6%
More than one above	4	7.3%
Friend	2	3.6%
Other	18	32.7%

8. Did you have Health Career experience prior to the entry into the R.T. program?

Yes		No	
15	27.3%	40	72.7%

If your response is yes, please specify.

9. Did you switch to radiologic technology from another major?

Yes		No		To a certain extent	
17	30.9%	37	67.3%	1	1.8%

RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

10. Have you obtained employment as a radiographer?

Yes		No	
51	94.4%	3	5.6%

11. If you are not employed as a radiographer, have you obtained employment in a health-related field?

Yes		No	
7	53.9%	6	46.2%

If your response is yes, Please specify.

12. Have you decided not to seek a job in radiologic technology by choice (e.g., family obligations)?

Yes		No	
5	20.8%	19	79.2%

13. If you have obtained employment as a radiographer, is it .....

Full Time	45	88.2%
Part Time: 0-20%	2	3.9%
21-40%	2	3.9%
41-60%	2	3.9%
61-80%		
81-90%		

14. If you have already obtained employment, what is your present salary/year?

Below $6,000	1	1.9%
$6,001 to $8,000	1	1.9%
$8,001 to $10,000	0	
$10,001 to $12,000	1	1.9%
$12,001 to $14,000	0	
$14,001 to $16,000	1	1.9%
$16,001 to $18,000	2	3.9%
$18,001 to $20,000	6	11.5%
$20,001 to $22,000	9	17.3%
Above $22,001	31	59.6%

15. If you have obtained employment, what is the primary setting of your present area of employment?

Acute Hospital	30	56.6%
Clinic or health center	2	3.8%
Radiologists' office	8	15.1%
Other Physicians' office	5	9.4%
Educational Institution	2	3.8%
More than one above	4	7.6%
Other _____ (please specify)	2	3.8%

16. If you are employed, what is the official title of your job?

See attached.

17. Were your expectations of your present job in radiography realistic?

Yes		No	
46	86.8%	7	13.2%

If your answer is no, please explain.

18. How much orientation did your employer offer?

1 week	7	15.6%
2 weeks	15	33.3%
3 weeks	1	2.2%
1 month	6	13.3%
None	5	11.1%
No set amount	1	2.2%
More than one month	6	13.3%
Other	4	8.9%

19. How much orientation did you feel was necessary for you to fulfill your role expectations?

1 week	11	23.4%
2 weeks	14	29.8%
3 weeks	1	2.1%
1 month	14	29.8%
None	4	8.5%
No set amount	1	2.1%
More than one month	2	1.3%
Other		

20. If you are still seeking employment, what is the aspiration you have for a job setting? If you are working, what job setting would you ideally want to be in?

Acute Hospital	10	40.0%
Clinic or health center	1	4.0%
Radiologists' office	2	8.0%
Other physicians' office	4	16.0%
Educational institution	4	16.0%
More than one above	2	8.0%
Other _____ (please specify)	2	8.0%

21. Are you employed in or seeking radiologic technology employment in Kern County?

Yes		No	
41	78.8%	11	21.2%

22. If you are working in Kern County, would you like to remain in Kern County?

Yes		No	
45	88.2%	6	11.8%

23. Are you interested in working in rural areas?

Yes		No		Perhaps	
11	21.2%	40	76.9%	1	1.9%

24. Have you enrolled in any post-graduate program/course(s) leading to addition licenses or baccalaureate degree?

Yes		No	
17	30.9%	38	69.1%

If your response is yes, please specify the program, license, and institution.

25. Are you planning to enroll in an educational program unrelated to radiologic technology?

Yes		No		Perhaps	
21	39.6%	30	56.6%	2	3.8%

Reaction to Bakersfield College's R.T. Program

26. Did you have a realistic picture of what radiologic technology was all about before you entered the Program?
Please specify

Yes		No	
31	57.4%	23	42.6%

27. Was the course content in the R.C. Radiologic Technology Program.....

Excellent	21	38.9%
Good	25	46.3%
Adequate	8	14.8%
Poor	0	

28. How interesting or challenging did you find your classroom time in the B.C. Radiologic Technology courses?

Very interesting/very challenging	9	16.7%
Interesting/challenging	28	51.9%
All right	15	28.8%
Dull	2	3.7%

29. How interesting or challenging did you find your clinical time in the B.C. Radiologic Technology courses?

Very interesting/very challenging	28	50.9
Interesting/challenging	25	45.5
All right	2	3.6
Dull	0	

30. Do you feel the Radiologic Technology staff of B.C. was supportive when you needed aid and encouragement or advice?

Very definitely	36	65.5%
Somewhat	13	23.6%
I received minimum help	6	10.9%

31. How well were you prepared for new employer expectations?

Very well	32	59.3%
Adequately	21	38.9%
Poorly	1	1.9%

32. To what extent were the instructors' expectations of you as a student similar to employer expectations of you as a graduate?

Very similar	18	34.0
Usually the same	28	52.8%
Usually different	3	5.7%
Very different	4	7.6%

To what extent do you feel the following measurements indicated your ability to perform as a registered radiographer:

33.	American Registry of Radiologic Technologists and State of California, Certified Radiologic Technologist Licensure Exam.....	Very well Adequately Not at all	30 22 2	55.6% 40.7% 3.7%
34.	Grades received in Radiologic Technology courses (R.T., medical terminology, and patient care).....	Very well Adequately Not at all	21 30 2	39.6% 56.6% 3.8%
35.	Grade received in life science and math courses(chemistry, anatomy, physiology, algebra).....	Very well Adequately Not at all	14 34 4	26.9% 65.4% 7.7%
36.	Grades received in communications courses(English, speech).....	Very well Adequately Not at all	9 35 8	17.3% 67.3% 15.4%

		Yes		No		Perhaps	
37.	Would you recommend the B.C. Radiologic Technology program to a friend who was qualified to enter the program?	49	92.5%	2	3.8%	2	3.8%

		Yes		No	
38.	Would you like to see advanced radiologic technology courses offered through continuning education programs at B.C.?	43	84.3%	8	15.7%

If your response is yes, please specify which courses.

39. List strong and weak points of the Bakersfield College radiologic technology education program in your opinion.

STRONG	WEAK
1st Year	1st Year
2nd Year	2nd Year

RT Graduate Survey

Combined Results

5. Year of High School Graduation

Prior to 1960	4	7.6%
1960-1965	5	9.4%
1966-1970	12	22.6%
1971-1975	22	41.5%
1976-1980	10	18.9%
Since 1980	0	

16. Official job title if employed:

X-Ray Tech.	10	19.2%
Registered Radiographer	1	1.9%
Licensed Ultrasonographer	1	1.9%
Radiologic Technologist	20	38.5%
Diagnostic Medical Sonographer	1	1.9%
T.A. RT Program	1	1.9%
Nuclear Med. Tech.	4	7.7%
Other	14	26.9%

Staff Radiation Therapy Technologist	1
Radiographic Technician	1
Nuclear Med. Tech./Ultrasound Tech.	1
C.T. Tech.	3
Diagnostic Radiographer	1
Ultrasound Technologist	1
Nuclear Med./X-Ray Tech.	1
RPMS	1
Diagnostic Technologist	1
Special Procedures Tech.	1
X-Ray Ranger	1
CNMT-Staff Nuclear Ultrasound Tech.	1

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
8118 Math-Sciences Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

JUL 13 1984